

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-17 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 6, and 12 are independent. In the Office Action dated June 13, 2008, Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-20 remain in this application with Claims 18-20 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated June 13, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,976,209 ("*Storisteanu*"). Claims 1, 6, and 12 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "setting, at the recognizer application, a property value identifying a desired action to be performed on the text string, wherein the property value comprises a parameter equal to the desired action that is to be automatically performed in response to recognizing the text string as belonging to a given semantic category." Amended Claims 6 and 12 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 13, lines 22-27.

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *Storisteanu* at least does not disclose setting a property value identifying a desired action to be performed on a text string. (See Office Action page 9, lines 3-6.) For example, *Storisteanu* merely discloses that a live parser: i) sets display attributes for text elements in an edit view according to document syntax; ii) records classes in an edit system with information regarding various constructs found in a document; and iii) sets up activemarks accordingly. (See col. 5, lines 14-19.) Furthermore, as stated by the Examiner, *Storisteanu* fails to disclose element properties identifying desired actions. Consequently, *Storisteanu* cannot disclose a property value parameter identifying an action that is to be automatically performed in response to recognizing a text string as belonging to a semantic category. Rather, *Storisteanu* merely discloses a live parser setting element display attributes.

Storisteanu would not have led to the claimed invention because *Storisteanu* at least does not disclose “setting, at the recognizer application, a property value identifying a desired action to be performed on the text string, wherein the property value comprises a parameter equal to the desired action that is to be automatically performed in response to recognizing the text string as belonging to a given semantic category,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 6 and 12 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 6, and 12 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 6, and 12.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-11, and 13-17 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 6, and 12, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 6, and 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-11, and 13-17.

II. New Claims

Claims 18-20 have been added to more distinctly define and to round out the protection for the invention to which Applicants are entitled. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable over the cited art and that they add no new matter.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any

such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: September 15, 2008

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

